

Remarks

Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-15 and 31 are pending.

In the above amendments, claims 16-30 are canceled, without prejudice, from further consideration in this application. Applicants are NOT conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 16-30 are not patentable over the cited art. Claims 16-25 are canceled in this Amendment solely because they are non-elected claims, and claims 26-30 are canceled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 16-30, as presented prior to this Amendment, and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

Moreover, with the above amendments, applicants are clarifying one or more aspects of the present invention in a bona fide attempt to further prosecution of this application, and not in acquiescence to any of the rejections. Support for these amendments may be found throughout applicants' specification, including, for instance, paragraphs 44, 45, 49, and 54. Therefore, no new matter is added.

In the Office Action, dated October 2, 2007, claims 1-6, 7-15, 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Siamak et al. (EP 0969,371 A1); and claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siamak et al. in view of Wilson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,454). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse these rejections to any extent deemed applicable to the amended claims.

In accordance with an aspect of the present invention, a capability is provided for facilitating the configuring of communications environments. In one example, logical CHPID numbers are assigned to physical channels in a manner that minimizes single points of failure or single points of repair. An automatic linkage of a logical definition of a channel to a physical channel is selected that best exploits the reliability, availability, and serviceability of an environment.

In one particular example, applicants claim a method of facilitating configuring of resources of a communications environment (e.g., independent claim 1). The method includes, for instance, automatically mapping a first identifier of a resource of a machine being configured to a second identifier of the resource to assign a physical path of the resource to a logical path of the resource, wherein the first identifier is usable by hardware to identify the resource and the second identifier is usable by a program of the machine to identify the resource, and wherein the mapping is based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair.

Thus, in this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, a first identifier of a resource of a machine being configured is mapped to a second identifier of the resource to assign a physical path of the resource to a logical path of that resource. This mapping is based on the physical structure of the machine being configured and on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair. This is not described, taught or suggested in Siamak.

Siamak reads device identifiers from storage devices in a computer system and uses the device identifiers to create a mapping associating the device identifiers with corresponding physical paths to the storage devices. Upon reconfiguration of the storage devices, the computer system again reads device identifiers from storage devices in order to verify that that the system was reconfigured correctly. So, in Siamak when there is a reconfiguration, the system uses a mapping file to determine if there was a mistake made during the reconfiguration. There is, however, no description, teaching or suggestion in Siamak of mapping logical identifiers to physical identifiers, wherein the mapping is based on avoiding single points of failure or single points of repair, as claimed by applicants. Siamak makes no reference to single points of failure or single points of repair in describing or creating its mapping table (see, e.g., paragraphs 19-24 of Siamak). Since Siamak fails to describe, teach or suggest at least this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that Siamak does not anticipate applicants' claimed invention.

Based on the foregoing applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over Siamak. Further, Wilson does not overcome the deficiencies of Siamak.

Moreover, the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features. For instance, dependent claim 31 indicates that the mapping is for a machine being configured prior to installation. This is in contrast to Siamak, which is for machines already installed.

For all of the above reasons, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with applicants' attorney, please contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller
Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: March 3, 2008

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579